

# WHIG REPUBLICAN

AMOS B. CORWINE,

"LIBERTY AND UNION—NOW AND FOREVER—ONE, AND INSEPARABLE."

[EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR]

VOLUME 1.]

LEXINGTON, HOLMES COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1840.

[NUMBER 1.]

## POETRY.



### THE RETURN.

She comes to me in loveliest smiles,  
With soul as pure as ever;  
Plays o'er her fascinating wiles,  
That won my heart forever—  
With airy step, and beautiful face,  
With eyes of darkest hue,  
With lovely neck and nymph-like grace,  
With breath of fragrant dew.  
Beneath her eye's half-opening lid,  
Bright tears of joy are seen;  
I've seen the like 'mong rose buds hid,  
Fresh tears of night's fair queen.  
Just as the sun drinks in those tears,  
As early morn awakes,  
So I'll kiss off 'mid sighs and fears,  
Love's dew from Margaret's cheeks.

### REFLECTION.

The past—where is it! It has fled.  
The future! It may never come.  
Our friends departed! With the dead,  
Ourselves! Fast hastening to the tomb.  
What are earth's joys! The dews of morn.  
Its honours! Ocean's wreathing foam.  
Where's peace! In trials meekly borne.  
And joy! In Heaven, the Christian's home.

From the Cincinnati Republican.

### GENERAL HARRISON'S SPEECH AT CARTHAGE, OHIO.

We insert, according to promise, so much of Harrison's speech at Carthage, on the 20th inst. as related to the subject of abolition.

Having recently received a letter from a personal friend, who is a member of an abolition society, proposing to me two questions, which he requested me to answer; but having from necessity, arising from the absolute impossibility of my answering the numerous letters I receive, requiring my opinion upon political subjects, declined to answer any from individuals, I willingly embrace the opportunity of answering them which this occasion has given me, without violating the rule I had found myself under the necessity of adopting.

The questions are the following, viz:—  
1st.—Do you believe the people of the U. States possess an unrestricted right to discuss any subject, that to them may seem worthy of consideration?

2nd.—Do you believe the people of the U. States have the right to petition their legislature for the redress of whatever they may deem a grievance, and for the adoption of such measures as the petitioners may think conducive to the welfare of the nation?

I do not hesitate to answer both of these questions in the affirmative. The constitution of the United States, and that of our own state, have secured to the people the enjoyment of the rights referred to in both questions, entirely unrestricted but by their own sense of propriety, and the legal rules which protect the rights of others.

The freedom of speech and of the press, are the distinguished characteristics of free government. Without them we might call our country a republic, but it would be so only in name, like that of Rome, under the emperors, it might be a mask to cover the most horrible despotism. The right of the people to write and to speak openly and freely upon all matters of public policy, "is the palladium of all civil and religious liberty." The authors of our Constitution must have known that it would be subject to abuses to be used for improper and indeed sometimes for criminal purposes; yet they declared it without restriction. More than half a century has passed away since it came into operation, and although upon one memorable occasion it was resorted to for the purpose of giving effect to councils tending to paralyze the efforts of the nation, in the midst of a dangerous war, and to encourage the enemy to persevere in supporting their unjust pretensions, still these declarations of rights in relation to writing, speaking and publishing, have been suffered to remain in all their pristine force. I should be the last person who could, under any circumstances, consent to restrict them by legal enactments.

I must, however, take this occasion to repeat, what I have before declared, that the discussion of the right of one portion of the States which compose our Union to hold slaves by an assemblage of citizens of other States which hold none, is in my opinion not sanctioned by the spirit of the Constitution. If it is tolerated by the broad and unrestricted declaration in the Constitution, to which I have referred, it is forbidden by the general tenor of that instrument and the fundamental principle of the government, which it has established. Our government is certainly one of a very complicated character—difficult in some of its aspects to be well understood. To foreign governments it presents, and was intended to present, a power clothed with the most important attributes of sovereignty, and so far as our relations with them may be concerned, they are to see nothing beyond that which is described in our glorious motto, "E

Pluribus Unum." We are, however, not "one" in the senses that it would be understood, if applied to other nations, which have been formed from once disjointed and separate parts. Our Union is not that which, like marriage, merges the whole rights of the parties in a common stock. We are not

"Joined like meeting rivers  
Which roll into the sea one common flood,  
And are no more distinguished."

Our union is more properly like an ordinary co-partnership composed of a number of individuals, who each furnish a portion of capital, to be subjected to the control of the majority of the partners, but who each also retain another portion under their own exclusive management. With the latter, neither the partners collectively nor individually have any more right to interfere, than if there existed no sort of connection between them. This is, also, the theory of our General and State Governments. Over the powers retained by the States respectively, neither the General government nor the other States, nor the citizens of other States, can exercise the least control. If this opinion is correct, it follows that discussions in public assemblies, in relation to the institutions of other States, with a view to alter or affect them, was not in the contemplation, either of those who framed the Constitution, or those by whom it was adopted. Let us apply the theory I endeavor to maintain to this assembly. We are here, some 3000 persons, in the double character of citizens of Ohio and citizens of the United States.

In the first place, we can undertake the consideration and discussion of any subject belonging to our State policy, embody our sentiments in the shape of resolutions or petitions, and in the event of a supposed grievance, present them to the appropriate State authorities for redress. As citizens of the United States we are competent to consider and discuss any subject of national policy, and by a similar process submit the result of our deliberations, if we should choose to do so, to the department of the Federal Government which possess the power to give us relief. But in which of these characters, either as citizens of Ohio, or citizens of the U. States, could we, consistently with the theory and spirit of the constitution, discuss a subject belonging exclusively to any other State?

There are many principles to be found in the constitutions of some of the States (other than the toleration of slavery) which are very much unlike those of Ohio. The property qualification of voters for instance. This is a restriction upon the right of suffrage to which personally I am opposed. I would accord this important privilege to every citizen. Having ascertained that he was a citizen, I would not proceed to enquire the amount of money he had in his pocket at the time, or what other species of property he might possess. With these sentiments I might offer for your adoption a resolution declaring that the restricted suffrage in some of the States was an aristocratical feature in their systems of government and should be abolished. Such a proposition could not fail to create much surprise, and bring to the mind of every man in the assembly that neither in his capacity as a citizen of Ohio, nor of the U. States, could he interfere with the people of Massachusetts, Virginia and Mississippi in the management of their domestic concerns. Should I be asked if I thought any harm could arise from such a discussion, I answer decidedly in the affirmative, harm in more ways than one. It would tend more, perhaps, than any thing else to destroy the idea of the perfect individuality and distinctness of the State government which has ever been considered as one of the most important features in our system, and prepare the minds of the people for the prostration of the barriers which have been erected with so much art and care between the General and State Governments, and those of the States respectively, and finally led to that dreaded consolidation which, in the opinion of our wisest and best statesmen, would be the immediate and precursor of the downfall of liberty.

It could not fail, also, to impair, if not entirely destroy, those feelings of confidence and affection between the citizens of the respective States, which is the only effectual bond of our Union. From the discussion of any question in an abstract form, no possible injury could arise. I conclude with the repetition of my opinion that the right of the people to write on, speak on and discuss any subject which they may deem worthy of consideration, and that of petitioning for the redress of any thing "which they may consider a grievance," are secured to them both by the Federal and State Constitutions, and that these rights can neither be impaired or restricted. The abuse of these rights is no argument for abolishing them. In the forcible language of the late distinguished Chief Justice of the U. States "it is an evil inseparable from the good to which it is allied, a shoot which cannot be stripped from the stalk without vitally wounding the plant from which it is torn."

The population of the city of Buffalo is estimated at 31,000.

From the National Intelligencer.

### THE DIVORCE—HOW IS IT!

The New York Express states that the bank of America, in that city, with a capital of two millions, has only about thirteen hundred thousand dollars lent out on discounted paper, while they have, or had a few weeks since, "nearly three millions lent to government on their Treasury notes. The bank is now, in fact, the agent of the Government. Mr. ALLEN, the Receiver of the Independent Treasury, has an office in one corner, within its walls, uses the vaults of the bank, and to all intents and purposes, the bank and the Government are as closely connected, and more so than it ever was with the United States bank. The Bank of the United States could not, by its charter, lend the Government over a half a million, without a law of Congress. The bank of America can lend three millions, or any other sum, at any moment and on any terms as satisfactory to Mr. NEWBOLD; possibly the directors may be consulted after the loan is made."

The following, from the New York Commercial Advertiser, gives us a further insight into the practical working of this sub-Treasury, by which the Government was to be "divorced from the Banks."

"The principles of the Sub-Treasury Bill are enforced just so far as to secure the collection of specie enough to pay the office-holders—just so far as is necessary to keep up such a distinction in the currency as will secure gold for the household troop, and rags for the people—and no further. Let a merchant of known responsibility go to the collector to pay a bond, for instance, of a thousand dollars, and present his own check upon the Bank of America for seven hundred and fifty dollars, drawn in the ordinary form, and another of his own checks for the remaining two hundred and fifty dollars, adding the words "in specie," and his bond will be given to him. Both checks will go to the bank together, he carried through the books together, and the specie drawn upon neither; or, if drawn it would only be done in the farcical way of counting it out by the paying teller, to be counted in again by the receiving teller, and in thirty minutes he stowed away in the same vaults again where it was before. The Receiver General keeps his office in the bank, and the whole change here result in the simple fact that a party favorite has been provided with a snug berth at FOUR THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS A YEAR, for doing, or having done, in the Bank of America, what Messrs. Newbold and Thompson did exactly as well without pay in the Bank of America before! But in other parts of the Union, where the people and the banks have not been able to bear up under the cruel policy of the Government as well as they have done in New York, and where the banks have not been able to resume specie payment, the other part of the Sub-Treasury is in operation. Specie is there exacted—the Government and its officers clutching all the hard money that comes within their grasp, and the rags are literally left for the People. Further than this, and in all that has been said about a divorce of Bank and State—especially in the city of New York—the Sub-Treasury is sheer imposture."

The Express says—"A person to whom the U. States is indebted presents the evidence with which he has been furnished by the proper officer, of that indebtedness, for payment.

The Treasurer takes that evidence and returns him Treasury Notes, and asks him to sign a receipt of which the following is a copy:—

WASHINGTON,

"I have received of the Treasurer of the United States, Treasury notes of the following number and denominations, to-wit:

No. ——— For the sum of ——— \$ ———, which, said notes are received by me in exchange for the sum of \$ ——— deposited by me in specie to my credit in the Treasury of the United States.

Signed, A — B —  
Thus the payment of this debt is effected by creating another: the evidence of the original debts is called a deposit of specie in the Treasury.

So that the debts of the government, whatever may be their amount, are made to constitute a fund, upon which an unequally unlimited amount of Sub-Treasury Notes may be issued.

This is the new credit system, which it certainly required the power of a magician to establish.

Let one of those notes be presented at the Treasury for payment. The Treasurer takes it, ask the holder to sign a receipt that he has deposited its amount in specie in the Treasury, and then gives him a new note! This is the "new way to pay old debts."

The notes thus issued cannot be issued under the five million act, but are the fruits of the Sub-Treasury, and show what a dangerous power has been conferred by this abominable act on the Executive."

REFINED DELICACY.—"I would thank you for the impudence."—I was the lady said at the table, when she wanted the sauce.

GEN. WILLIAM H. HARRISON.

The Van Buren men say Gen. Harrison is in the keeping of a committee—is the Mum Candidate. Let every candid man read his reply to a letter, addressed to him from the President of the Harrisburg convention in 1839, upon his communicating the official proceedings of his nomination, and decide how true the charge is. The charge is too ridiculous to be made except by desperate men. We challenge the friends of the "Little Magician" to produce a letter of his more to the point on all the leading subjects that the people demand of their candidates, than the following.

General Harrison says that the following are among the principles to be adopted by any Executive sincerely desirous to restore the administration to its original simplicity and purity, viz:

1. To confine his services to a single presidential term.

3. To disclaim all right of control over the public treasure, with the exception of such parts of it as may be appropriated by law, to carry on the public services, and that to be applied precisely as the law may direct, and draw from the treasury agreeably to the long established forms of that department.

2. That he should never attempt to influence the elections, either by the people of the state legislatures, nor suffer the Federal officers under his control to take any other part in them than by giving their own votes, when they possessed the right of voting.

4. That in the exercise of the veto power, he should limit his rejection of bills to, 1st.—Such as are in his opinion, unconstitutional; 2d.—Such as tend to encroach on the rights of the states or individuals; 3d.—Such as involving deep interests, may, in his opinion, require more mature deliberation or reference to the will of the people, to be ascertained at the succeeding elections.

5. That he should never suffer the influence of his office to be used for purposes of a purely party character.

6. That in removals from office of those who hold their appointments during the pleasure of the Executive, the cause of such removal should be stated, if requested, to the Senate, at the time the nomination of a successor is made.

And last, not least in importance.

8. That he should not suffer the executive department of the government to become the source of legislation; but leave the whole business of making laws for the Union to the department to which the constitution has exclusively assigned it, until they have assumed that perfected shape, where and when alone the opinions of the executive may be heard.

6.—We notice two announcements, in different parts of the country, of speakers to address Van Buren meetings—both a little remarkable. At Erie, Pa., on the 10th—the day of the Bunker Hill Convention—Orestes A. Brownson was to speak to the people.

This person is editor of the Boston Quarterly Review, and the author of an article which recently appeared in that journal addressed to the laboring classes—an article so revolutionary in its character, that, although the writer is an office-holder under the Administration, we were unwilling to ascribe to the party with which he acts the sentiments and principles contained in it. It proposes, among other things, to destroy the banks, to do away with churches and abolish the priesthood; it denounces the system of wages, and regards it as a species of servitude, and finally recommends that a man's property at his death shall not descend to his children, but go to the State to be by the State disposed of.

Is it the wish of the administration party to identify itself with these doctrines? If not, a decent regard to the public sense of propriety, of religion and social order, might suggest that the advocate of them should be kept silent in the presence of the people at meetings held under the auspices of the party.

The other speaker whose announcement excited surprise, is Peter V. Daniel, a District Judge of the United States Court in Virginia, and, by virtue of his office, honorable. He addressed a meeting of the administration party in Fredericksburg a few days ago.—Let the president write letters to vindicate his democracy and to show his ignorance of "military affairs"—let the Vice-president mount the stump and talk of his own merits—let the Governors of States canvass Ohio and Tennessee—but while official robes are dragged in the dirt, let the ermine of the Judge, at least, be kept unstained.

Gov. POINDEXTER AND GEN. HARRISON.—On a late visit of Governor Poindexter to the Warm Springs in Virginia, he was invited to address the people on the subject of the Presidency. He did so, and in relation to General Harrison's course on the Missouri question, he stated that he was by Gen. Harrison's side in Congress, when that memorable controversy was agitated, and the latter said to him personally—"I know that I shall sacrifice my popularity with my constituents by the course I am now about to pursue, but I will sooner incur the sacrifice than the constitution of my country shall be violated."

THE BRIDE.—I know of no sight more charming and touching than that of a young and timid bride, in her robes of virgin white, led up trembling to the altar. When I thus behold a lovely girl in the tenderness of her years, forsaking the house of her fathers, and home of her childhood—and, with the implicit confidence, and the sweet self-abandonment, which belong to woman, giving up all the world for the man of her choice; when I hear her, in the good old language of the ritual, yielding herself to him "for better, for worse, for richer, for poorer, in sickness and in health, to love, honor and obey, till death us do part"—it brings to mind the beautiful and affecting devotion of Ruth—"Whither thou goest I will go, and where thou lodgest I will lodge; thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God."—Wash. Irving.

FOREIGN PAUPERS.—The almshouse yesterday presented a scene well calculated to make Americans more fully appreciate their own institutions, and feel grateful to a benign Providence for having cast their lot where none but the idle and vicious need be paupers.

The following persons arrived here by the British barque Chieftain, on Monday, from Liverpool, and were yesterday taken in a body to the almshouse, viz:

John Sharp, 14 years old, has been two weeks in the poor house; Thomas Reed, 31 years old, afflicted with the king's evil seven years, and has been ten years in the poor house; Hugh Lacky, 23 years old, has been five years in the poor house; John Devon, 16 years old, was ten years in the poor house; William Mackay, 15 years old, was four years in the poor house; James Lewis, 16 years old, an idiot; Thomas Devon, 13 years old, has been nine years in the poor house; Janette Reynolds, grandmother of John Sharp, aged 58 years, was three years in the poor house;

A steamer being on an even keel at sea, the comfort of the passengers is greatly promoted. Their spars being light, they roll more easily than a ship, and above all, when the wind does not come ahead, they can take in sail, and still pursue their course in a straight line, with a speed very little diminished. Upon the whole, my opinion is that the enterprise of ocean steam navigation will succeed, both in winter and summer. And if the power can be safely augmented to the scale of our American river boats, the length of stroke being nearly double, and the revolutions one or more, I believe the passage can be made from land to land on an average of from 11 to 14 days. This is fast enough. Certainty is ever more desirable than day or two more or less on the voyage.

[Jour. & Ade.

THE MISSOURI IRON MOUNTAIN.—We learn from the U. S. Gazette, that the mining company chartered by the state of Missouri to work the Iron Mountain, are in a fair way to commence operations. They have purchased 27,000 acres of the Mountain tract, and have 5000 on the Mississippi, in which is the site for the town contemplated, and from whence there is to be a railroad to the Mountain. Some of the cutlery of this iron exhibited at Philadelphia, has a fine polish which does not tarnish—supposed to be owing to the remarkable purity of the ore and its freedom from foreign ingredient.

GOING TO THE PACIFIC.—A company is said to be forming in Missouri with a capital of ten millions, to make a permanent settlement on the Columbia river. We thought the tide of emigration would soon begin to set towards the Pacific. Here is the first beginning. People went stop at the Rocky Mountains.—As to the Yellowstone, Mandan regions, Prairies, Upper Mississippi, Iowa, &c. Fudget High Away! is the word it is true, but not so close by as these places.—N. Y. Eve. Star

A HUMANE LAW.—The Georgia Legislature has enacted a law, that when any person shall die, leaving a widow and children, the executor or administrator, shall allow, out of the estate of the deceased, to such widow and children, a reasonable support for the space of one year, notwithstanding any debts of the deceased.

ANTI-ABOLITION.—The house of representatives of Ohio, has adopted anti-abolition resolutions by a strong majority. Resolutions of like character, have also passed the Indiana house of representatives by a vote of eighty-seven to one.

STILL TALLER.—They may talk as much as they please about tall people in Vermont and Kentucky, but we have a chap in Louisiana, who looks above any sample they can show in those parts. He is so tall that he lets himself out at camp meetings to stand as a steeple!—Pittsburg.

The population of the city of Washington is set down at 23,577 souls. During the past year, there were erected 37 brick buildings, four of which were of three stories, and 33 of two stories.

ADVANTAGE OF RAILROADS.—It was stated in a late debate in the British Parliament, that the Liverpool and Manchester railroad had produced an advantage to each of these towns of at least £100,000 a year.

"LIVE AND LET LIVE."—"I can stand the Sub-Treasury if any man can," said an independent farmer as he put his name to a renunciation of Van Burenism. "I have 240 acres of land paid for—a dairy of 16 cows, and a good stock of young cattle and hogs—while I owe no man any thing. But I want young men to have the same chance I had.

"How did you accumulate your property, Mr. B?"

"I began with my hands. I bought my land on a credit, and found men who were willing to trust me with other property. The produce of my farm I sold for good bank bills, and with them I paid my debts. That is the way for a poor man to get along in the world."

Young men who begin with your hands—ye huge paws who earn your own living, will you support a system which will keep you upon a piece of bran bread all your lives!